

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.



THE NATURE AND ANTECEDENTS OF WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

JOANNE LYN MULLINS

MLLJOA008

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award
of the Degree of Master of Commerce in Organisational Psychology

Faculty of Commerce

University of Cape Town

2008

COMPULSORY DECLARATION:

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: signature removed

Date: ...24.03.09.....

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Definition of Work Family Enrichment	3
Antecedents of Work-Family Enrichment	8
<i>Personality Characteristics Antecedent</i>	9
Positive Affectivity	9
Self-efficacy	10
<i>Work Commitment</i>	11
<i>Work Engagement</i>	12
<i>Social Support</i>	13
Final Notes	16
METHOD	19
Research Design	19
Participants	19
Procedure	20
Measures	21
Data Analysis	24
RESULTS	24
Factor Analysis	24
Reliability Analysis	25
Correlation Analysis	25
Multiple Regression Analysis	26
<i>Proposed W2F enrichment antecedents</i>	28
<i>Proposed F2W enrichment antecedents</i>	34
T-Test Analysis	38

DISCUSSION	40
Dimensionality	40
Antecedents of Work-Family Enrichment	41
<i>Positive Affectivity</i>	41
<i>Self-Efficacy</i>	42
<i>Work Commitment</i>	44
<i>Work Engagement</i>	44
<i>Social Support</i>	45
<i>Group Differences</i>	49
Suggestions for Future Research	50
Implications for Management	53
Final Notes	56

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to identify and examine the antecedents of work-family enrichment. Data gathered from 221 participants employed at a South African FMCG enterprise showed that two personality characteristics, positive affectivity and self-efficacy helped predict both directions of work-family enrichment while work commitment and work engagement were shown to be significant for an individual experiencing work to family enrichment. Social support from various sources was examined (i.e. family, supervisors and perceived organizational support). Family support and perceived organizational support helped predict greater family to work enrichment and work to family enrichment respectively, yet contrary to expectations, supervisory support was not shown to increase work to family enrichment. Importantly, this study confirmed the multi-dimensionality of the work-family enrichment scale.

Consequent to the emergence of the positive psychology movement (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brindley, 2005), researchers of work-family interface have shifted focus from conflict and scarcity to research that recognizes the benefits gained from the interaction between work and family (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003). Such research investigates how the resources, values, moods, behaviours and experiences accumulated in one domain (i.e. family) can impact positively on the other domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Wayne, Randel & Stevens, 2006).

The positive aspects of the work-family interface were first mooted in the late 1970s. Marks (1977) proposed that humans had abundant energy that could be expanded and that participation in one role could have a positive effect on the performance in other roles and Sieber (1974) stated that gratification from role accumulation tended to outweigh any stresses that could arise. These propositions have received renewed attention recently and researchers have defined various terms to describe the positive interface between work and family. These include positive spillover, engagement, enhancement, facilitation and enrichment.

The work-family enrichment construct has enjoyed sustained research attention over the past three years. Work-family enrichment is defined as the improvement of the quality of one role due to experiences in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). It is a bi-directional construct such that the improved quality of life in the individual's work role can be caused by experiences and resources gained in the family role and then transferred to the work role that enhances the

performance in the work role and vice versa (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007).

Work-family enrichment has been shown to positively predict organizational commitment, job satisfaction and work effort as well as being negatively related to turnover intentions (Wayne, Musisica & Fleeson, 2004). Grzywacz and Butler (2005) found that it enhanced mental and physical well-being. Given the potential value of the above organizational salient work outcomes it is certainly important to understand the antecedents of work-family enrichment (Wayne et al. 2006).

This study focuses on investigating the antecedents of work-family enrichment. The antecedents examined, gleamed from the limited available literature, include personality characteristics (i.e. positive affectivity and self-efficacy), individuals' work commitments and work engagement, non-work support (e.g. support from family), and the sources of two informal organizational supports (i.e. direct supervisors and perceptions of a supportive organizational culture).

The primary aim of this study is to address gaps in the work-family literature. As previously stated very little research has considered the antecedents of work-family enrichment. Understanding the factors that enhance work-family enrichment will allow organizations to develop interventions to improve work-family enrichment and the outcomes that follow it.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature research was conducted on family-work enrichment using six research databases (Business Source Premier, PsychInfo, Science Direct, Academic Source Premier, Humanities International Complete and Emerald). Work-family enrichment, work-family interface, work-family facilitation, social support, supervisor support, family support, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, positive affectivity, role commitment, work commitment and work centrality were the key words searched ("work-family enrichment", "work-family interface", "work-family facilitation", "social support", "supervisor support", "social support", "family support", "perceived organizational support", "self-efficacy", "positive affectivity", "role commitment", "work commitment", "work engagement" and "work centrality"). These key words were also used to develop search strings to enable searches that were more specific. After a set of core papers was collected, a citation search was conducted every month on each core article. As work-family enrichment is a relatively new construct, the above searches yielded few results and broader more conceptual searches were also conducted.

Definition of Work-Family Enrichment

Work-family enrichment refers to the extent that experiences in one role can have beneficial effects on another role and vice versa. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) developed a theoretical model that depicted their theory of work-family enrichment and stated that there are three psychological mechanisms that can account for positive outcomes. First, participation in multiple roles can have a positive effect on the individual's well-being. Second, one role can provide as a

buffer for the other role during time of duress. The third mechanism refers to the participation in one role that can produce positive outcomes and experiences in the other role. The work-family enrichment model focuses on this third mechanism.

Their work-family enrichment model identifies numerous resources that could be generated within a role. These resources are skills (interpersonal, copying and multitasking), perspectives (valuing different cultural backgrounds, trust and understanding different individual's problems), physical psychological resources (e.g. self-esteem, personal hardiness and optimism) and flexibility (e.g. time, pace and location where the roles meet), material resources (e.g. money and gifts) and social capital resources (e.g. increases in influence and information).

According to this model the resources from one role can be transferred to the other via two separate pathways. The first path, the instrumental path, transfers the resources from one role directly to the other role. In the second pathway, the resources enhance a positive aspect in the first role that is then transferred to the other role. The resource then improves the other role's performance. This path is referred to as the affective path.

Researchers have used different constructs to investigate the positive side of work-family interface namely positive spillover (Hanson, Hammer & Colton, 2006; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), enhancement (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), facilitation (Wayne et al. 2007) and enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). These constructs are often used interchangeably to

describe the positive interaction between work and family. However one must note that each of these constructs is distinct and it is important to define each construct to ensure a greater understanding of the term work-family enrichment used in this study.

Work-family facilitation refers to "the extent to which an individual's engagement in one life domain (i.e. work/family) provides gains (i.e. developmental, affective, capital, or efficacy) which contribute to enhance functioning of another life domain (i.e. family/work)" (Wayne et al., 2007, p 64). This construct is different to work-family enrichment as work-family enrichment uses the individual as the unit of analysis (Carlson et al., 2006) while facilitation focuses on improvements in the functioning of the systems (Grzywacz et al., 2007)

Enhancement is defined as the acquisition of resources and experiences that would be beneficial for individuals in their life (Sieber, 1974). Therefore enhancement focuses on the possibility that benefits could have for an individual, enrichment focuses on improved role performance due to resources gained from another role (Carlson et al., 2006). Interestingly, Graves, Ohlott and Ruderman, (2007) defined work-family enhancement as the acquisition of resources and experiences that are gained in one role and then transferred to a second role whereby the resource will improve attitudes and performance. This definition is congruent with the way that enrichment is defined, not the way that enhancement is typically defined.

Lastly, positive spillover is a term that is used to refer to personal characteristics such as moods, values and behaviours that are

experienced in one domain and transferred to another domain (Hanson et al., 2006). However, the transfer of these moods and behaviours do not improve the quality of life in the other role. While enrichment is based on the notion of positive spillover, a distinction between the two constructs is that enrichment implies that the experiences gained in one role will not be merely transferred to the other role but bring about an increase in the other role's performance (Carlson et al., 2006). Another distinction between the two constructs is that positive spillover implies that personal gains (i.e. in moods, skills and values) are transferred from one role to the other while enrichment includes other resources such as social capital and material assets that go beyond the definition of positive spillover (Hanson et al., 2006).

Carlson et al. (2006) developed and validated a measure of work-family enrichment. It is a self-report measure that captures the extent to which resources gained in one role or domain and transferred to another would result in the improved quality of life in the other role. The scale contains six dimensions with three dimensions for both work to family (W2F) enrichment and family to work (F2W) enrichment. W2F enrichment consisted of work-family development, work-family affect and work-family capital while F2W enrichment consisted of family-work enrichment, family-work affect and family-work efficiency.

Work-family development and family-work development occur due to an increase in intellectual and personal development (i.e. self-fulfillment, confidence and accomplishment) in one role that enhances involvement in another role. For example, an individual's involvement in their family could lead to refining or acquiring skills (i.e. patience and teamwork) that could assist them in being a better worker. Work-

family affect and family-work affect refer to moods that impact on a role but are generated through involvement in another role. For example, if the individual is excited about new developments at work it could lead to a celebration at home. Work-family capital was defined as involvement of work that leads to improvement of resources such as the acquisition of economic and social assets that ultimately benefit the family. Work provides individuals with the monetary assets needed to support a family, it can also provide a sense of social status due to the position they hold in their professional life. Family-work efficiency refers to the involvement in the family role that leads to increased focus or urgency that enables the individual to be an improved employee.

Proposition 1: W2F enrichment consists of three different dimensions, work-family affect, work-family capital and work-family development.

Proposition 2: F2W enrichment consists of three dimensions, family-work affect, family-work efficacy and family-work development.

Table 1
Studies of work-family interface antecedents

Antecedent	Direction	Supporting Studies
Personality Characteristics	Both directions	Boyar & Mosley (2007); Wayne et al. (2007); Witt & Carlson (2006)
Work Characteristics	W2F	Grzywacz & Butler (2005); Thompson & Prottas (2005); Wayne et al. (2007)
Work social support	W2F	Wadworth & Owen (2007)
Work identity	W2F	Wayne et al. (2006); Wayne et al. (2007)
Family friendly policies	W2F	Wayne et al. (2006)
Perceived organizational Support	W2F	Wayne et al. (2006); Wadsworth & Owen (2007); Thompson & Prottas (2005); Wayne et al. (2007); Witt & Carlson (2006)
Family identity	F2W	Wayne et al. (2006)
Non-work Support	F2W	Wayne et al. (2006); Wadworth & Owen (2007); van Steenbergen et al. (2007)

Previous research of work-family antecedents are summarized in Table 1 and Table 2 references the studies that have measured work-family enrichment using self-report scales.

Table 2
Studies measuring work-family enrichment with self report scales

Study	Name of the concept	Direction	Mean
Boyar & Mosley (2007)	Facilitation	W2F	3.32
		F2W	3.82
Grzywacz & Bass (2003)	Facilitation	W2F	2.61
		F2W	3.42
Grzywacz & Butler (2005)	Facilitation	W2F	2.64
Grzywacz & Marks (2000)	Positive Spillover	W2F	2.61
		F2W	3.42
Hanson et al. (2006)	Positive Spillover	W2F	3.38
		F2W	3.69
Thompson & Prottas (2005)	Positive Spillover	Not Differentiated	2.97
Wadsworth & Owen (2007)	Enhancement	W2F	3.10
		F2W	3.56
Wayne et al. (2004)	Facilitation	W2F	2.88
		F2W	3.34
Wayne et al. (2006)	Enrichment	W2F	4.10
		F2W	3.96
Witt & Carlson (2006)	Enrichment	W2F	3.12
		F2W	3.23
Van Steenbergen et al. (2007)	Facilitation	Not Differentiated	N/A

Antecedents of Work-family Enrichment

As previously mentioned the antecedents that will be investigated in this study include personality characteristics, role commitment and social support. The two personality characteristics that will be investigated are positive affectivity and self-efficacy. Role commitments to be examined include commitment to an individual's role work environment work engagement. Lastly, social support will be

investigated as an antecedent of enrichment. Social support in this study will be divided into three sections namely, non-work support from family, support from direct supervisors and perceived organizational support.

Personality Characteristics Antecedents

Personality characteristics have long been used to help explain an individual's attitudes, moods and behaviour (Boyar & Mosley, 2007). This study investigates two personality characteristics that could possibly assist an individual to experience the work-family interface in a positive way. These personality characteristics are aspects of an individual that encourage positivity and enable the individual to actively seek and experience developmental experiences and positive emotional states (Wayne et al, 2006). Two such characteristics are positive affectivity and self-efficacy.

Positive affectivity

Positive affectivity reflects the positive engagement with the environment that leads to positive emotions, broadens the attention scope and increases positive moods (Pettit, Kline, Genncoz, & Joiner, 2001). Individuals with higher levels of positive affectivity interpret unclear events with more optimism and generally have a more positive perspective on life.

Wayne et al. (2007) states that as the individual focuses on the positive aspects of a particular role, they would be more inclined to recognize the benefits and take advantage of experiences to ensure that the work role would have a positive impact on the family role. By extension, positive affectivity is likely to contribute to generating skills

and perspectives that will benefit performance in the individual's family role. Thus, positive affectivity can also improve the quality of life in the work role due to the perceived positive impact that the work role has on the family role.

One could also propose that positive affectivity would encourage the individual to find and focus on the positive aspects within their family role thereby developing resources, skills and perspectives within the family role that would improve the success of their work role. Therefore the following two propositions are proposed:

Proposition 3: Positive affectivity helps explain the variance in W2F enrichment.

Proposition 4: Positive affectivity helps explain the variance in F2W enrichment.

Self-efficacy

Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as the individual's belief that they can successfully perform a given function. High self-efficacy has been shown to increase success in the workplace (Judge & Bono, 2001) and is a personal characteristic of individuals who are more eager to attempt difficult job tasks and actively try new things that they may have learnt within the working environment. Wayne et al. (2007) proposed that an employee with high self-efficacy is more likely to seek more opportunities and experience greater success. Such an employee is more likely to propose interventions that could generate resources (i.e. new skills, perspectives, positive moods and economic resources).

While the literature for surrounding this personality characteristic antecedent is limited, it is reasonable to assume that self-efficacy

would lead to work-family enrichment. Self-efficacy provides the individual with the necessary drive to fully engage with their role and benefit from their engagement. No research was found on self-efficacy and F2W enrichment, however one could suggest that if the personality characteristic which leads to increased success within one role (work) it should increase the success within another role (family). Therefore if the individual experiences success and has a belief that they can successfully perform a family role function there is a greater chance that the individual would be able to develop resources such as skills, perspectives and moods that would then be transferred to the work role. Thus, the following propositions are proposed:

Proposition 5: Self-efficacy helps explain the variance W2F enrichment.

Proposition 6: Self-efficacy correlates significantly with F2W enrichment.

Work Commitment

Self-concept is defined by the importance that an individual places on their family identity or work identity (Aryee & Luk, 2006). As multiple identities form an individual's self concept there is a chance that attitudes developed in the one identity can be transferred to the other identity. Identities developed through commitment, which are important to one, are inclined to be prominent in the individual's mind thereby allowing the individual to utilize in another role (Wayne et al., 2006). Commitment to a role will increase investment that will result in greater role experiences and increase the likelihood that resources (psychological and physical resources, work related skills and positive moods) are generated that can be transferred (Graves et al., 2007).

Wayne et al. (2004) provided evidence that greater time spent at work was positively related to work-family enrichment. Job involvement has also been associated with enrichment between work and family (Rothbard, 2001). The greater time spent at work indicates greater commitment to work (Wayne et al. 2006) Graves et al. (2007) reported that an individual who has strong commitment to their work role would provide a positive benefit to their family role. Work skills such as negotiating, motivating and developing others would benefit the individual in their family environment. Therefore, the following is proposed:

Proposition 7: Work commitment helps explain the variance in W2F enrichment.

Work engagement

Work engagement is the complete psychological presence of individuals in role activities (Kahn, 1990). An individual that is fully engaged in his role has a sense of energetic and effective connection to their role and believe that they are capable of handling the demands of their job (Schaufeli, Martinez, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker 2002). Other benefits from role engagement are that it may lead the individual to experience greater gratification, self-esteem and positive emotional responses to the role (Rothbard, 2001). Work engagement has also been defined as the positive motivation fulfillment that is characterized by vigor, absorption and dedication to one's role (Heuven, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Huisman, 2006). Individuals experience work engagement through being strongly involved in their work (vigor), experiencing feelings of pride, enthusiasm, inspiration and challenge (dedication) and being engrossed and experiencing a sense of intensity completing the work (absorption) (Langelaan, Bakker, van Doornen & Schaufeli, 2006).

Therefore, individuals who are dedicated and absorbed in their work, have a greater chance of experiencing and developing positive resources in their work place that would have a positive spin off for their family role. Thus, it is proposed:

Proposition 8: Work engagement helps explain the variance in W2F enrichment.

Social Support Antecedents

Environmental resources are pivotal to the individual experiencing enrichment (Wayne et al. 2006). Halbeslen (2006) stated that social support might come from a variety of sources such as family, friends, co-workers and supervisors. Informal organizational support may also include perceived organizational support through an organization's work-family supportive culture (Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Grzywacz & Marks (2000) found that social support, whether it was perceived at work or from the family, improved the individual's performance in the other role. Cobb (1976) suggested that social support is the individual's perception that they are loved, cared for, valued and esteemed as a member of a network of mutual obligation.

Non-work support can be received from both family and friends (Wadsworth & Owens, 2007). According to the Greenhaus and Powell's (2006) model of work-family enrichment the availability of resources within the family role will ultimately impact on the individual's work experiences. Wadsworth and Owens (2007) found a strong positive relationship between non-work support and F2W enrichment. They reported that respondents who experienced supportive behaviour from people outside the workplace developed resources that enhanced positive feeling towards their personal life and energy that would then be transferred into the work environment.

King, Mattimore, King, & Adams (1995) stated that emotional support and instrumental support are two types of family supports received by an individual that have been empirically reported to impact that individual's attitude and performance in the workplace. Both forms of support have been shown to improve life and job satisfaction. Instrumental support is described as attitudes and behaviours of family members that assist with household chores and are accommodating with the individual's work requirements (Wayne et al., 2006). In other words, the family members assist the individual with their responsibilities within the family environment. Emotion work within a familiar context or emotional support refers to the enhancement of another's emotional well-being (Erickson, 1993). This support and relationship with family members would provide the individual with valuable work advice and a buffer to stressful experiences at work (Graves et al., 2007) thus, the support provides the individual with a sound base on which to take advantage for the resources available in the family role. Due to these forms of support one could anticipate that family support would positively relate to F2W enrichment. Therefore it is proposed:

Proposition 9: Family support helps explain the variance in F2W enrichment.

Social support at work can be derived from many sources, however the most frequently researched are the support received from co-workers and supervisors as they are more likely to have contact and provide potential aid to the individual (Wadsworth & Owen, 2007). Social support at work from both co-workers and supervisors has been shown to increase work performance and the family well-being (Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997). Baker, Israel and Schurman (1996) indicated that both co-worker and supervisor support decreased

negative feelings toward work while co-worker support was associated with decreased levels of depression.

Employees who receives support from their supervisor has less inclination to resign (Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999), experiences lower stress levels (Frone et al., 1997), searches for alternative jobs less often and feels more committed to their employing organization (Thompson et al., 1999). Thus, if the person is fully engaged in his work it is likely that more resources will be developed and transferred which would benefit the family role. It is therefore proposed:

Proposition 10: Supervisory support explains the variance in W2F enrichment.

Another form of informal work support is perceived organizational support. Perceptions of organizational support have been found to strongly relate to outcomes, namely job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment (Allen 2001). One of the many ways in which employees perceive organizational support is through a supportive organizational culture. It has been suggested that a supportive organizational culture has had a greater impact on employee outcomes than the formal organizational support such as family friendly benefits (Behson, 2005). A family supportive culture is described as where employees are not penalized for devoting time with their families and there is general managerial support for employees' family needs (Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999). Wayne et al., (2007) stated that Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) declared that a supportive culture would create resources namely, advice, flexibility and time as well as psychological resources such as self-acceptance. A supportive culture is also one that provides the individual with the

necessary support, namely alternative working arrangements, daycare and extended family leave benefits which assist the individual in developing a work-family balance (Moore, 2006).

Wayne et al. (2007) argued that this support would enable the employees to feel supported by their management to balance their work and family roles while it encouraged individuals to utilize the resources available in order to increase their performance in both his/her family and work role. It is thus a supportive organizational culture that would positively relate to the employee's work role as well as positively relate to the family role. Therefore the following is proposed:

Proposition 11: Perceived organizational support explains the variance in work-family enrichment.

Final Notes

A review of the literature helped identify and define three categories of antecedents to work-family enrichment (namely, personality characteristics, role commitments and social support) that are possible antecedents of work-family enrichment.

The personality characteristics are part of an individual personality that could enhance the effects of work-family enrichment. These characteristics enable individuals to identify positive aspects in a role and ensure that the person believes in their ability to apply new learnt things within the other roles. Work commitment and work engagement refers to the individual's absorption and involvement in their work. The third category, social support is divided into three sections namely, non-work support, informal work support and perceived organizational support. Non-work support is provided by family members, informal

support refers to the support that is provided by supervisors and perceived organizational support is where the culture would allow the person to create resources such as time and flexibility that would enhance an individual's well-being.

METHOD

This chapter is divided into four parts. First, the study's research design is presented. Second, a detailed description of the participants is given. This is followed by the method used to collect the data. Last, the scales used to measure the different construct are defined and explained.

Research Design

The quantitative and descriptive research study (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998) aimed to provide a broad overview of a representative sample. Data was collected using a self-report survey within an FMCG (fast moving consumable goods) organization. The cross-sectional nature of the research design allowed for a description of the sample at a given point in time.

As with many of the work-family researches this study's results reply on a cross sectional design which limits possibility of making causal inferences (Graves et al., 2007). Another concern is that only self-report measures were used, creating the possibility that the relationships between the construct are inflated due to common method response bias (Wadsworth & Owen, 2007). However, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) stated that even though self-reports may be biased and inaccurate, a large quantity of knowledge was gained on work-family conflict using self-reports. They believe that researchers must continue to assess work-family enrichment through self-report questionnaires. All measures used in this study have been successfully used in previous studies.

Participants

Participants (n=221; 46% response rate) were employees from a major FMCG enterprise. This enterprise is involved in the bottling and distribution of beverages within the Western and Northern Cape. It consists of three companies, two manufacturing plants and eight distribution centres, which employs over 1600 people.

Of the 221 respondents, 89 women and 128 men, four respondents did not indicate their gender. Of the respondents 65% were either married or living with a partner, 27% were single and 5% were divorced. The average age of the respondents was 36 ($SD = 0.49$). Over a third (35%) had one or more children under the age of six at home. In terms of education, 15% had not matriculated, 79% had matriculated and those that had matriculated 65% had a diploma or degree.

Permanent employees accounted for 88% of respondents. The average number of hours worked per week was 44.18 ($SD = 8.94$) and the average years of working experience was 10.50 years ($SD = 9.01$). The average tenure of the respondents at the organization was eight years. The respondents varied across the occupational levels within the organization, 9% were from the senior management team, 30% were middle management and 19% were in professional roles while 32% of the sample was in administrative or clerical positions. This sample was representative of the employees who work within this organization. The average tenure at the organization is ten years. The salaried staff consists of 4% senior managers, 47% administrative positions and the professional and middle management account for 49% of staff members.

Procedure

Data was collected through a self-report questionnaire, using scales adapted by the researcher from past questionnaires. The closed-ended questionnaire had five point Likert rating scale, with 1 being "strongly disagrees" and 5 being "strongly agree".

A preempting email was sent to all employees by the HR Director a week before the questionnaire was administered. This email described the purpose of the study and provided employees with an understanding of what would be asked. The questionnaire was administered personally to each employee by the researcher. Each participant was also given a sweet in appreciation of their anticipated participation. Once the respondents had completed the questionnaire they were asked to place it in marked boxes in the reception areas. The researcher personally spoke to the participants two days before the deadline to remind potential respondents and thank respondents who had completed the questionnaire.

Measures

Positive Affectivity: The positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS) was used to measure positive affectivity (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS consists of two ten item scales. The one scale measures positive affectivity and the second measures negative affectivity. For the purpose of this study only the 10 items that measured positive affectivity were used. The items on each scale are rated from 1-5. Therefore the scores of positive affectivity and negative affectivity may range from 10 to 50. Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) reported a coefficient alpha of .90 in their study.

Self-Efficacy: Self-efficacy was measured by means of the new general self-efficacy scale (NGSE) (Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001). This is an eight item scale which asks participants to respond according to a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). It has been shown to predict specific self-efficacy for a variety of tasks as well as demonstrate high reliability. This scale was shown to have a coefficient alpha of ,86 (Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001).

Work Commitment: Work commitment was measured using the occupational role commitment sub-scale from the set of Life Role Salience Scales (LRSS), which measures the intended level of commitment of personal time and energy to engage in the different roles (Amatea, Cross, Clark & Bobby, 1986). An example of an item from this scale is "I expect to devote whatever time and energy it takes to move up in my job field". Graves, Ohlott et al., (2007) reported a coefficient alpha of ,73 from this sub-scale.

Work Engagement: A shortened version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2002) was used to measure work engagement among the respondents. This scale consisted of six items. Examples of items from this scale include "My job inspires me" and "I am proud of the work I do". The coefficient alpha reported in this research was ,91.

Family Support: The scale used to measure family support was adapted from the Thomas and Ganster (1995) supervisory support scale. It asked employees to rate their supervisor's family supportive behaviour towards them. Examples include: "My family shares ideas or

advice" and "my family listens to my problems". The scale utilized a 5 point Likert scale and consisted of nine items.

Supervisory support for career: A nine item supervisory support scale developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990), was used to measure supervisory support for the individual's career. Response items included: "My supervisor supports my attempts to acquire additional training or education to further my career" and "My supervisor provides assignments that give me the opportunity to develop and strengthen new skills." The scale is a 5-point Likert scale with a response set of 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree". Greenhaus et al. (1990) reported the coefficient alpha of this scale as ,93.

Supervisory support for family: Thomas and Gansters (1995) supervisory scale was used to measure the supervisor's support for the employee's family ($\alpha = ,75$). It consisted of nine items that asked the employees to rate their supervisor's supportive behaviours according to a 5-point Likert scale. "My supervisor helps me to figure out how to solve a problem" and my supervisor is sympathetic and understanding" are examples of items from the scale.

Perceived Organizational Support: Perceived organizational support for family was measured by using Allen's (2001) family supportive organizational perception (FSOP) scale ($\alpha = ,73$). There are fourteen items within this scale. The items reflect the individual's perception of the assumptions and experiences within an organization pertaining to the interactions between work and family. Samples of these items include, "work should be a priority in a person's life" and

"it is best to keep family matters separate from work." These items are rated using a five-point Likert scale. Perceived organizational support for the individual's well-being was measured by the shortened version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support scale (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armaeli, 2001). Examples of items include: "My organization strongly considers my goals" and "My organization cares about my opinions". Rhoades et al. (2001) reported a Cronbach alpha of ,90.

Work-family Enrichment: Carlson et al., (2006), developed the Work-Family Enrichment scale used in this study. The scale consists of three W2F dimensions (development, affect, capital) and three F2W dimensions (development, affect, efficiency). The scale consists of 18 items, three items for each dimension. Carlson et al. (2006) reported a coefficient alpha of ,92 for their whole scale. The respondents were asked to rate their responses according to a 5-point Likert scale.

RESULTS

This section is divided into five parts. First, the results of the factor analysis which examined the dimensionality of the scales was presented. Second, the reliability of each scale, determined using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, is examined. Third, the correlation analysis that shows the strength and direction of the linear relationship among the variables is presented. Multiple regression analysis, used to explain the variance of work-family enrichment is set out next and lastly, t-tests were conducted to compare differences across gender, education, occupational levels, and marital status.

Factor Analysis

Each scale measuring a proposed antecedent was subjected to factor analysis applying principle axis factoring method and when appropriate, oblimin rotation. Appendix A shows the factor analysis of the proposed variables. All the proposed antecedents' variable scales were unidimensional with an eigenvalues exceeding 1. Scree plot analysis confirmed the unidimensionality of the scales.

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the dimensionality of the theoretically established *work-family enrichment* scale. The approach used in this study replicated the steps taken by Carlson et al. (2006) to validate the *work-family enrichment* scale. Confirmatory analysis was first conducted on the six factors of the scale which was then compared to three other possible models. First, a four factor model was anticipated. It was represented by two dimensions *W2F efficiency* and *F2W capital*. The other two factors were estimated by collapsing two dimensions of enrichment, affect and

development across the work and family direction. The second model represented the two directions of enrichment namely, *W2F* and *F2W*. Last, a one factor model was established that represented the whole enrichment scale. All the *work-family enrichment* items in each of these models were forced to load on a single factor. Table 3 indicates the fit indices for each of the models. The six-factor model has the best fit therefore it is the best suited. These findings confirm propositions 1 and 2 that each direction of *work-family enrichment* consists of three distinct dimensions.

Table 3:

Estimate of fit indices for competing models of work-family enrichment

Model	χ^2	df	P	CFI	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA
Six factor model	271.22	120	0.00	0.95	0.88	0.82	0.07
Four factor model	747.90	129	0.00	0.80	0.69	0.59	0.15
Two factor model	1046.42	134	0.00	0.71	0.60	0.49	0.19
One factor model	1842.91	135	0.00	0.45	0.42	0.26	0.30

Reliability Analysis

The reliability of each scale is presented in Table 4 on the diagonal. The reliabilities were extracted using Cronbach's Alpha and all the scales met or exceeded ,7, the conventional level of acceptance (Hair et. al, 1998) except work commitment which Cronbach alpha was ,66. Table 4 also provides the means and standard deviations for each scale.

Correlation Analysis

Table 4 shows the relationship between each variable using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Positive affectivity was positively related to *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,56$, $p = ,0001$) and *F2W enrichment* ($r = ,36$, $p = ,0001$) respectively. *Self-efficacy* was also positively related to *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,26$, $p = ,0001$) and positively related to *F2W enrichment* ($r = ,22$, $p = ,01$).

High levels of *work commitment* were positively related to *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,32$, $p = ,0001$) and *WFE* ($r = ,28$, $p = ,0001$). *Work engagement* was positively correlated to *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,58$, $p = ,0001$) and *WFE* ($r = ,58$, $p = ,0001$).

The scales *supervisor supports family* ($r = ,45$, $p = ,0001$) and *supervisor supports career* ($r = ,45$, $p = ,0001$) were both significantly and positively related to *W2F enrichment*.

The *family support* scale was positively and significantly related to *F2W enrichment* ($r = ,19$, $p = ,01$) and *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,43$, $p = ,002$). *Organizational support for career* was positively and significantly related to *W2F enrichment* ($r = ,63$, $p = ,0001$) and to *F2W enrichment* ($r = ,119$, $p = ,015$).

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted between *W2F enrichment* and its proposed antecedents and between *F2W enrichment* and its proposed antecedents.

Table 4
Means, standard deviations, correlations and Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for research scales

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. WC	3.71	0.62	(0.66)																	
2. SE	4.15	0.47	0.30***	(0.86)																
3. SSC	3.24	0.86	0.13	0.19*	(0.93)															
4. SSF	3.38	0.78	0.11	0.17	0.75***	(0.87)														
5. OSF	3.34	0.60	-0.09	0.08	-0.03	0.07	(0.75)													
6. OSW	3.19	0.77	0.17	0.14	0.55***	0.57***	-0.03	(0.87)												
7. FS	3.90	0.53	0.13	0.36***	0.12	0.19*	0.06	0.16	(0.77)											
8. W2FD	3.69	0.78	0.23*	0.29***	0.33***	0.34***	-0.10	0.52***	0.30***	(0.86)										
9. W2FA	3.04	0.92	0.28***	0.14	0.30***	0.32***	-0.19*	0.51***	0.15	0.57***	(0.93)									
10. W2FC	3.43	0.94	0.32***	0.26**	0.53***	0.49***	-0.07	0.61***	0.17	0.65***	0.66***	(0.92)								
11. W2FE	3.39	0.76	0.32***	0.26**	0.45***	0.45***	-0.14	0.63***	0.23*	0.84***	0.87***	0.90***	(0.92)							
12. F2WE	3.79	0.55	0.10	0.22*	0.12	0.14	-0.03	0.19*	0.43***	0.40***	0.27***	0.25**	0.35***	(0.90)						
13. F2WD	3.72	0.69	0.04	0.23*	0.08	0.11	0.04	0.17	0.39***	0.40***	0.25**	0.24**	0.33***	0.86***	(0.87)					
14. F2WA	4.00	0.65	0.05	0.21*	0.00	0.05	-0.03	0.03	0.42***	0.24**	0.12	0.10	0.17	0.81**	0.55***	(0.93)				
15. F2WEff	3.63	0.66	0.16	0.09	0.22*	0.18	-0.08	0.28***	0.26**	0.35***	0.31***	0.29***	0.36***	0.82**	0.58***	0.47***	(0.92)			
16. WFE	3.59	0.54	0.28***	0.29***	0.38***	0.38	-0.11	0.54***	0.38***	0.79***	0.75***	0.76***	0.88***	0.75**	0.67***	0.53***	0.67***	(0.91)		
17. WE	4.71	1.32	0.26**	0.23**	0.38***	0.33***	-0.01	0.47***	0.17	0.43***	0.50***	0.58***	0.58***	0.33**	0.30***	0.16	0.36***	0.58***	(0.91)	
18. PA	3.70	0.81	0.31***	0.24**	0.38***	0.37***	-0.02	0.46***	0.24***	0.45***	0.47***	0.52***	0.56***	0.36**	0.33***	0.20*	0.36***	0.57***	0.73***	(0.93)

Note: Reliabilities are presented on the diagonal; N=199 (case wise deletion); *p<.01; **p<.001; ***p<.001; WC = Work commitment, SE = Self-efficacy, SSC = Supervisor support for career, SSF = Supervisor support for family, OSF = Organisation support for family, OSW = Organisation support for well-being, FS = Family support, W2FD = work-family development, W2FA = Work-family affect, W2FC = Work-family capital, W2FE = Work to family enrichment, F2WE = Family to work enrichment, F2WD = Family-work development, F2WA = Family-work affect, F2WEff = Family-work efficacy, WFE = Work-family enrichment, WE = Work engagement, PA = Positive affectivity

Proposed W2F enrichment antecedents

The multiple linear regression analysis between *W2F enrichment* and its proposed antecedents was conducted in four steps. First, *self-efficacy* and *positive affectivity* were entered into the equation. Once the results had been recorded, *work commitment* and *work engagement* were included. In step 3, *supervisor support for the family* and *supervisor support for the employees' careers*, were also computed. In step four *perceived organizational support* was added (i.e. *organization support for well-being* and *organization support for family*).

The above was then repeated using each of W2F dimensions as outcome variables: *work-family development*, *work-family affect* and *work-family capital*.

Presented in Table 5 are the results for the multiple linear regression analysis between *W2F enrichment* and its proposed antecedents. *Self-efficacy* ($\beta = ,14, p < ,01$) and *positive affectivity* ($\beta = ,52, p < ,0001$) are statistically significant in predicting *W2F enrichment*. Collectively the two personality traits accounted for 33% of the variance in *W2F enrichment* ($R^2 = ,33, p < ,0001$). These results are consistent with proposition 3 and 5.

Work commitment ($\beta = ,13; p < ,001$) and *work engagement* ($\beta = ,36, p < ,0001$) both significantly helped predict *W2F enrichment* and their addition contributed a small but significant additional explanatory variance ($\Delta R^2 = ,08, p < ,0001$). These results supported proposition 7 and 8.

When the support variables were added to the equation they collectively added an incremental explanatory variance of 6% ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $p < .0001$). However only *supervisor support for family* was significant (*Supervisor supports family*: $\beta = .17$, $p < .01$; *supervisor supports career* $\beta = .12$, *ns*). These results proved to be inconsistent with proposition 10 regarding the relationship between *supervisory support* and *W2F enrichment*.

Table 5

Linear regression analysis: W2F enrichment and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Step 1				
SE	0.14*	0.09	0.06	0.09
PA	0.52***	0.24**	0.17*	0.12
Step 2				
WC		0.13**	0.14*	0.11*
WE		0.36***	0.31***	0.24**
Step 3				
SSC			0.12	0.02
SSF			0.17*	0.08
Step 4				
OSF				-0.12**
OSW				0.37***
R ²	0.33***	0.40***	0.46***	0.56***
Adjusted R ²	0.32***	0.38***	0.44***	0.53***
ΔR^2		0.08***	0.06***	0.09***

Note: * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$; N = 199 (case wise deletion); WC = *Work commitment*, SE = *Self-efficacy*, SSC = *Supervisor support for career*, SSF = *Supervisor support for family*, OSF = *Organisation support for family*, OSW = *Organisation support for well-being*, WE = *Work engagement*, PA = *Positive affectivity*

Once the perceived organizational support scales were entered, *perceived organizational support for well-being* emerged as a significant predictor of *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = .37$, $p < .0001$) while

organizational support for the family emerged as a significant predictor of *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = -.12, p < .001$). The *perceived organizational support* scales statistically explained the significant variance in *W2F enrichment* ($\Delta R^2 = .09, p < .0001$). As *perceived organizational support for the family* did not predict higher levels of *W2F enrichment*, proposition 11 was partially supported. Overall, the proposed antecedents of *W2F enrichment* explained 56% of the variance in *W2F enrichment* ($R^2 = .56, p < .0001$).

Table 6 shows the multiple regression analysis between *work-family development* and its proposed antecedents. *Self-efficacy* ($\beta = .20, p < .001$) and *positive affectivity* ($\beta = .41, p < .0001$) are statistically significant in predicting *work-family development*. The two personality characteristics collectively accounted for 24% of the variance in *work family development* ($R^2 = .24, p < .01$).

In step 2 *work engagement* was moderately significant in predicting *work-family development* ($\beta = .19, p < .01$) but *work commitment* was not significant in predicting *work-family development* ($\beta = .04, ns$). The inclusion of supervisors' support indicated a small but significant increase ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$), while neither forms of supervisor support were significant in predicting *work-family development*. *Perceived organizational support for one's well-being* was a significant predictor of *work-family development* ($\beta = .36, p < .0001$). The proposed antecedents explained 35% of the variance in *work-family development* ($R^2 = .35, p < .0001$).

Table 6:
Linear regression analysis: work-family development and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Step 1				
SE	0.20**	0.18**	0.16**	0.18**
PA	0.41***	0.26**	0.22**	0.17
Step 2				
WC		0.04	0.05	0.02
WE		0.19*	0.16	0.08
Step 3				
SSC			0.06	-0.02
SSF			0.13	0.04
Step 4				
OSF				-0.09
OSW				0.36***
R ²	0.24*	0.26	0.29*	0.37***
Adjusted R ²	0.24*	0.25	0.27*	0.35***
ΔR^2		0.02	0.03*	0.09***

Note: *p<.01 **p<.001 ***p<.0001, N = 199 (case wise deletion); WC = Work commitment, SE = Self-efficacy, SSC = Supervisor support for career, SSF = Supervisor support for family, OSF = Organisation support for family, OSW = Organisation support for well-being, WE = Work engagement, PA = Positive affectivity

The results from the multiple linear regression analysis conducted between *work-family affect* and its proposed antecedents are presented in Table 7. *Positive affectivity* ($\beta = .46$, $p < .0001$) was statistically significant in predicting *work-family affect* and *self-efficacy* was not a significant predictor *work-family affect* ($\beta = .02$, *ns*). During step 2 both *work commitment* ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$) and *work engagement* ($\beta = .32$, $p < .0001$) emerged as significant predictors of *work-family affect* and the two variables accounted for an additional 7% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $p < .0001$). Neither supervisory supports were significant in predicting *work-family affect*. In step 4 *organizational support for one's well-being* was a significant predictor of *work-family affect* ($\beta = .32$, $p < .001$). The addition of the

perceived organizational support also indicated a significant increase to the explained variance of *work-family affect* ($\Delta R^2 = ,09, p < ,0001$). Overall the work antecedents accounted for 40% of the *work-family affect* variance ($R^2 = ,40, p < ,0001$).

Table 7:

Linear regression analysis: work-family affect and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Step1				
SE	0.02	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01
PA	0.46***	0.20*	0.16	0.11
Step 2				
WC		0.15*	0.15*	0.12
WE		0.32***	0.30***	0.24**
Step 3				
SSC			0.01	-0.09
SSF			0.15	0.09
Step 4				
OSF				-0.17*
OSW				0.32**
R ²	0.22	0.29***	0.31	0.40***
Adjusted R ²	0.21	0.28***	0.29	0.37***
ΔR^2		0.07***	0.02	0.09***

Note: * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$, N = 199 (case wise deletion); WC = *Work commitment*, SE = *Self-efficacy*, SSC = *Supervisor support for career*, SSF = *Supervisor support for family*, OSF = *Organisation support for family*, OSW = *Organisation support for well-being*, WE = *Work engagement*, PA = *Positive affectivity*

The results for the multiple linear regression analysis between *work-family capital* and its proposed antecedents are indicated in Table 8. These results show that *positive affectivity* was significant in predicting *work-family capital* ($\beta = ,46, p < ,0001$) however *self-efficacy* was not significant in predicting *work-family capital* ($\beta = ,03, ns$). On adding *work commitment* and *work engagement* to the equation, the two variables significantly contribute to the explaining of the variance of

work-family capital engagement ($\Delta R^2 = ,07, p < ,0001$). Both *work commitment* and *work engagement* were significant in predicting *work-family capital*; *work commitment* ($\beta = ,15, p < ,01$) was moderately significant in predicting *work-family capital* while *work engagement* ($\beta = ,32, p < ,0001$) was significant as a predictor of *work-family capital*.

Table 8:
Linear regression analysis: work-family capital and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Step 1				
SE	0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.06
PA	0.46***	0.20*	0.16	0.11
Step 2				
WC		0.15*	0.15*	0.12
WE		0.32***	0.30***	0.24**
Step 3				
SSC			0.01	-0.09
SSF			0.15	0.09
Step 4				
OSF				-0.17*
OSW				0.32***
R ²	0.22	0.29***	0.31	0.40***
Adjusted R ²	0.21	0.28***	0.29	0.37***
ΔR^2		0.07***	0.02	0.08***

Note: * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$, N = 199 (case wise deletion); WC = Work commitment, SE = Self-efficacy, SSC = Supervisor support for career, SSF = Supervisor support for family, OSF = Organisation support for family, OSW = Organisation support for well-being, WE = Work engagement, PA = Positive affectivity

Neither supervisory supports were significant in predicting *work-family capital*. *Organizational support for one's well-being* emerged as a significant predictor of *work-family capital* ($\beta = ,32, p < ,0001$). The *perceived organizational supports for one's family* was also a significant predictor of *work-family capital* ($\beta = - ,17, p < ,0001$). Overall the proposed antecedents accounted for 37% of the variance of *work-family capital* ($R^2 = ,37, p < .0001$).

Table 9 presents the summary of regression results indicated by the significant beta weightings for *W2F enrichment* and its three dimensions.

Table 9
Summary table of regression results: W2F enrichment

Proposed Antecedents	Summary variable		Dimensions	
	W2FE	W2FD	W2FA	W2FC
PA: positive affectivity	-	-	-	-
SE: self-efficacy	-	**	-	-
WC: work commitment	*	-	-	-
WE: work engagement	**	-	**	**
SSC: supervisor supports career	-	-	-	-
SSF: supervisor supports family	-	-	-	-
OSF: organization supports family	**	-	*	*
OSW: organization support well-being	***	***	**	***

Note: * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$, - not significant

Proposed F2W enrichment antecedents

The multiple regression analysis between *F2W enrichment* and its proposed antecedents was computed in two steps. Step 1 included the personality characteristics, *positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy*. *Family support* was then added to the equation in step 2.

This method was then repeated for the three dimensions of family-work enrichment: *family-work development*, *family-work affect*, *family-work efficiency*.

The results from the family antecedents' multiple linear regression analysis between *F2W enrichment* and its proposed antecedents are indicated in Table 10. Both *positive affectivity* ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$) and

self-efficacy ($\beta = ,32, p < ,0001$) were statistically significant in predicting F2W enrichment. Collectively, they accounted for 14% of the variance in *F2W enrichment* ($R^2 = ,14, p < ,0001$).

Family support when included in step 2 resulted in significantly contributing to the change in the explanatory variance of 3% ($\Delta R^2 = ,03, p < ,0001$). These results support with proposition 4, 6 and 9.

Table 10:
Linear regression analysis: F2W Enrichment and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2
Step1		
SE	0.15*	-0.04
PA	0.32***	0.33***
Step 2		
FS		0.17**
R ²	0.14***	0.15***
Adjusted R ²	0.14***	0.14***
ΔR^2		0.03***

Note:* $p < .0.1$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$; N=211 (case wise deletion); SE = *Self-efficacy*, PA = *Positive affectivity*, FS = *Family support*

Table 11 presents the results between *family-work development* and its proposed antecedents. *Self-efficacy* is fairly significant in predicting *family-work development* ($\beta = ,16, p < ,01$) while *positive affectivity* ($\beta = ,28, p < ,0001$) was a significant predictor of *family-work development*.

Table 11:*Linear regression analysis: family-work development and proposed antecedents*

	Step 1	Step 2
Step1		
SE	0.16*	0.07
PA	0.28***	0.04***
Step 2		
FS		0.28***
R ²	0.12	0.19***
Adjusted R ²	0.11	0.18***
ΔR^2		0.07***

Note: * $p < 0.1$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$; N=211 (case wise deletion); SE = Self-efficacy, PA = Positive affectivity, FS = Family support

The inclusion of *family support* indicated that it is significant in predicting *family-work development* ($\beta = .28, p < .0001$). The addition of family supporting work also significantly contributed in explaining an additional 7% of the variance in *family-work development* variance ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .0001$).

Presented in table 12 is the multiple linear regression analysis between *family-work affect* and its proposed antecedents. *Self-efficacy* was a statistically significant predictor of *family-work affect* ($\beta = .18, p < .0001$) and positive affectivity was fairly significant in predicting *family-work affect* ($\beta = .15, p < .01$).

Family support emerged as significant in explaining the variance in *family-work development* ($R^2 = .11, p < .0001$). *Family support* was also significant in predicting *family-work affect* ($\beta = .36, p < .0001$).

Table 12:
Linear regression analysis: family-work affect and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2
Step1		
SE	0.18***	0.07
PA	0.15*	0.10
Step 2		
FS		0.36***
R ²	0.65	0.18***
Adjusted R ²	0.56	0.17***
ΔR^2		0.11***

Note: * $p < 0.1$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$; N=211 (case wise deletion); SE = *Self-efficacy*, PA = *Positive affectivity*, FS = *Family support*

The results from the multiple linear regression between family antecedents and *family-work efficiency* are indicated in Table 13. *Positive affectivity* was significant in predicting *family-work efficiency* ($\beta = .35$, $p < .0001$). *Family support* contributed significantly in explaining additional variance in *work-family efficiency* ($\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p < .001$). It was a significant predictor of family-work efficiency ($\beta = .18$, $p < .001$).

Table 13:
Linear regression analysis: family-work efficiency and proposed antecedents

	Step 1	Step 2
Step1		
SE	0.02	-0.04
PA	0.35***	0.33***
Step 2		
FS		0.18**
R ²	0.13	0.15**
Adjusted R ²	0.12	0.14**
ΔR^2		0.03**

Note: * $p < 0.1$ ** $p < .001$ *** $p < .0001$; N=211 (case wise deletion); SE = *Self-efficacy*, PA = *Positive affectivity*, FS = *Family support*

Table 14 presents the summary of regression results indicated by the significant beta weightings for *W2F enrichment* and its three dimensions.

Table 14
Summary table of regression results: F2W enrichment

Proposed Antecedents	Summary variable	Dimensions		
	F2WE	F2WD	F2WA	F2WEff
PA: <i>positive affectivity</i>	***	***	-	***
SE: <i>self-efficacy</i>	-	-	-	-
FS: <i>family support</i>	**	***	***	**

Note: *p<. 0.1 **p<. 001 ***p<. 0001; - not significant

Regression diagnostics were conducted, including an inspection of the normal probability plot of residuals for each regression equation. No problems were found.

T-TEST ANALYSIS

T-tests were conducted to investigate whether certain specified independent variables had an influence on levels of *work-family enrichment* in both directions (i.e. *W2F enrichment* and *F2W enrichment*). The independent variables assessed included gender, occupational levels (i.e. professionals and clerical), educational levels (i.e. matric and above matric) and marital status (married and unmarried). The results yielded no significant differences. There were no identified differences between the groups on *work-family enrichment*, *W2F enrichment* and *F2W enrichment* variables.

Table 15 presents a summary regarding support for the propositions.

Table 15
Summary of support for the propositions

Proposition Number	Description	Level of Support
Proposition 1	W2F enrichment consists of three dimensions	Supported
Proposition 2	F2W enrichment consists of three dimensions	Supported
Proposition 3	Positive affectivity explains the variance of W2F Enrichment	Supported
Proposition 4	Positive affectivity explains the variance of F2W Enrichment	Supported
Proposition 5	Self-efficacy explains the variance of W2F enrichment	Supported
Proposition 6	Self-efficacy explains the variance of F2W enrichment	Supported
Proposition 7	Work commitment explains the variance of W2F enrichment	Supported
Proposition 8	Work engagement explains the variance of W2F enrichment	Supported
Proposition 9	Family support explains the variance of F2W enrichment	Supported
Proposition 10	Supervisory support explains the variance of W2F enrichment	Not supported
Proposition 11	Perceived organizational support explains the variance of W2F enrichment	Partially supported

DISCUSSION

This study is an extension of the emerging work-family literature that emphasizes the positive aspects of the work-family interface. It has provided empirical evidence for the portability of Greenhaus and Powell's (2006) work-family enrichment model to South Africa and has identified the important antecedents of work-family enrichment. The following discussion reflects on the findings that relate to the nature of work-family enrichment and its antecedents.

Dimensionality

The confirmatory factor analysis confirmed that both directions of work-family enrichment (i.e. W2F enrichment and F2W enrichment) consisted of three distinct dimensions. W2F enrichment consists of the three dimensions work-family development, work-family affect and work-family capital. The three dimensions that form F2W enrichment include family-work development, family-work affect and family-work efficiency.

The results established that the scale met the developers' expectations of creating a thorough list of possible gains of enrichment as well as capturing them in a meaningful method to specify that the interplay of work and family would benefit one another. The items of the scale were developed to determine the full effect of *work-family enrichment* that included the transferring of resources gained in one role to another role in a manner that would enhance the individual's functioning. By validating the scale, it also serves to provide a scale that overcomes problems identified with existing tools that measure the positive side of the work-family interface. For example, the scale

measures the bidirectional impacts of work and family roles and assesses the multi-dimensional nature of enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006). This may provide noteworthy implications for future work-family interface research. For example, researchers may find that certain antecedents (i.e. family support) may impact on one dimension (i.e. family-work development) within the direction of work-family enrichment or that an individual's experience of one dimension (i.e. work-family affect) may lead to predict a specific outcome (work productivity).

Antecedents of Work-Family Enrichment

Two personality characteristics were proposed as antecedents for *work-family enrichment* namely, *positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy*. Both of these personality characteristics encourage an individual to be positive and to actively seek and experience developmental experiences and positive emotional states (Wayne et al, 2007).

Positive Affectivity

It was proposed that individuals with high levels of *positive affectivity* would experience greater work-family enrichment in both the *W2F enrichment* and *F2W enrichment* direction, the results supported these propositions. *Positive affectivity* was shown to help predict both *W2F enrichment* ($\beta=.52, p < .001$) and *F2W enrichment* ($\beta = .33, p < .0001$) as well as all six dimensions of the two *work-family enrichment* directions. Individuals with high levels of positive affectivity views different environments with a positive outlook, thus they are inclined to recognize the positive aspects within a given situation (Frederickson & Losada, 2005). As individuals with high levels of *positive affectivity* are able to recognize the positive aspect of a given situation they are

able to identify the benefits to be gained and utilize these benefits to achieve a positive experience (Wayne et al., 2007). These individuals then perceive resources, roles and moods in the working or family environment that could possibly have a positive impact on the other role.

The results of this study are consistent with Grzywacz and Marks (2000) who found that individuals with high levels of extraversion, which is characterized by high levels of *positive affectivity*, were more likely to believe that work could benefit family and vice versa.

Self-efficacy

As with *positive affectivity*, *self-efficacy* was shown to significantly explain the variance of both directions of *work-family enrichment* (W2F enrichment: $\beta = .14$, $p < .01$; F2W enrichment: $\beta = .15$, $p < .01$) however *self-efficacy* was shown only to be significant in explaining the variance of *work-family development* ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$) in the work-family direction and highly significant in the *family-work affect* ($\beta = .18$, $p < .0001$) and moderately significant to *family-work development* ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$) in the family-work direction.

Existing literature states that *self-efficacy* has been shown to increase success in the workplace (Judge & Bono, 2001), as it is one's belief that he can successfully complete a given task (Bandura, 1977). When individuals believe in their ability to successfully perform tasks it enables them to generate greater resources which could be effectively used within another role (Wayne et al., 2007). These findings suggest that *self-efficacy* assists an individual with gaining intellectual and personal resources that would benefit both the family and work role

while only the family role provides the individual with positive moods that would be transferred to the work role.

These findings indicate that individuals with higher levels of *positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy* are more likely to seek positive experiences and use these experiences to develop resources such as moods, perspective and skills that would assist them in their other role. For example the individual with high levels of *positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy* may perceive a challenging circumstance at work as an opportunity to develop skills, such as time management, team work and negotiation techniques which they can then use within their family role. The results also confirm Wayne et al.'s (2007) theoretical assumption that the two personality characteristics, *positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy* are likely to enhance an individual to experience positive work and family practices. This could lead to an individual acquiring new skills, perspectives and skills that would benefit the other role. The finding further indicates that individuals with high levels of *positive affect* and *self-efficacy* believe that if there is a stronger chance to develop positive resources in a role they would become more involved in this role to gain the maximum benefits. This could create greater innovation, productivity and commitment to their work that would be beneficial for the organization. Additionally, it could account for greater involvement in family responsibilities, improved communication and enhanced family cohesiveness, thereby positively impacting the family.

Work Commitment

The findings of the study support the proposition that *work commitment* helps predict *W2F enrichment*. *Work commitment* significantly helped predict *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = .13$; $p < .001$). Interestingly, work commitment was shown to be significant in predicting *work-family affect* and *work-family capital* and not *work-family development*. This indicates that *work commitment* is influential in assisting with gaining positive moods and economic resources but not for acquiring personal and intellectual resources. This result supports Graves et al.'s (2007) statement that commitment to a role will increase investment that will result in greater role experiences and increase the likelihood that resources (i.e. physical resources, work related skills and positive moods) are generated that can be transferred to another role. Graves et al. (2007) also reported that individuals who have strong commitment to their work role would provide a positive benefit to their family role. These benefits would be achieved through capital resources and positive moods.

If individuals are more committed to their work it is likely that it is also important to their self-concept or identity. Wayne et al. (2006) indicated that work identity made a difference in the experience of work-family enrichment beyond the situational factors. Work identity was shown to predict satisfaction, retention and organizational commitment.

Work engagement

Another important finding from this research was that *work engagement* helped predict *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = .36$, $p < .0001$). It was also shown to explain a significant portion of the variance in all

three dimensions of *W2F enrichment*. *Work engagement* is defined as the positive motivation fulfillment that is characterized by absorption and dedication to one's role (Heuven et al., 2006). The results of this study indicate that the more dedicated and absorbed individuals are in their work, the greater W2F enrichment they experience. Being fully engaged in their role provides them with a sense of energetic and effective connection to their role (Schaufeli et al., 2002) and individuals therefore identifies positive aspects from their work which they would be able to use successfully in their family role.

Social Support

Family support is received by an individual through the assistance of family members who provide emotional and instrumental support (King et. al., 1996). This form of support was shown to explain a significant portion of the variance of *F2W enrichment* ($\beta = .17, p < .001$). *Family support* also helped predict each dimension of *F2W enrichment*. These findings are consistent with Wadsworth and Owens (2007) who found that individuals who reported receiving support from family members stated that the problem solving approaches and skills used in their family life could also then be used in the workplace. These participants also indicated that the support they received increased their energy and positive feelings which were then transferred to their work role. Family support has also been shown to provide participants with an environment to receive the stresses of work (Graves et al., 2007) and assist the individual with family role responsibilities (Wayne et. al., 2006).

These above findings confirm Greenhaus and Powell's model, which implies that the availability of resources in the family role would

impact positively on the individual's work life. The findings are also consistent with Wayne et al.'s (2006) study, which found that feeling cared for in the family role were critical for experiencing *F2W enrichment*. That is for individuals to increase *F2W enrichment*, family members must be willing to listen to their individual's concerns, provide them with sound advice, assure them that their careers are important, and assist them with household chores or other family responsibilities.

Supervisory support for family was significant in predicting *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = .17, p < .01$). The support received from supervisors for one's family was shown to directly impact on the individual's *W2F enrichment*. This result suggests that the direct influence of *supervisory support* has been understated in previous research (Allen, 2001). Supervisors are directly responsible for implementing family-work policies; they therefore control the individual's experience of work-family balance. This finding is also consistent with Thompson and Prottas' (2005) results that the positive affects generated from a positive, friendly and helpful environment, coupled with the support received from the supervisor, was likely to result in enrichment that could then be transferred into the other role while positively enhancing the individual's attitudes and intentions. Their study also suggested that this support would generate satisfaction with life which could result in a reciprocal relationship. In other words, the individual would then be more likely to assist others with their concerns and problems.

Supervisory support for ones' career did not influence the individuals' perception of *W2F enrichment*. This could perhaps be explained with reference to the research context. Supervisors within the participating

organization do not have discretionary powers to promote or advance the careers of their subordinates. The supervisor would have to motivate for an individual to be advanced and then a discussion is held with relevant parties involved before a decision is made. The individuals within the organization are aware of this procedure and this could have influenced the result. This could differ at other organizations. The result also demonstrates the importance of the management methods organizations use that would directly impact on the individual's experience of *work-family enrichment*.

This study investigated whether high levels of *W2F enrichment* accompanied high levels of *perceived organizational support*. The *perceived organizational support* scale which measured employees' perception of their organizations' consideration for their well-being was both positively and statistically significant in predicting *W2F enrichment* ($\beta = .37, p < .0001$). This indicates that employees who perceive that the organization's culture as supporting their needs to be valued and developed would experience greater levels of *work-family enrichment*. As the individual believes the organization cares for their needs there is a greater opportunity that the individual would fully engage in the work role and develop resources which would then benefit the family role. Individual's perception of organizational support has been shown to influence their feelings of trust and long term obligations while increasing their ability to identify with the organization (Witt & Carlson, 2006).

When *perceived organizational support* was entered into the multiple regression equation, *supervisory support* ceased to be significant. This may suggest that *perceived organizational support* could be a

moderator in the relationship between social support and *W2F enrichment*. That is, *supervisory support* is related to the individual's perception that the organization is supportive of their needs, which once again highlights the importance *supervisory support* has on the individual's perception of organizational support.

Additionally, the findings indicated that *organizational support for family* was negatively related to *work-family enrichment*. This is contrary to other studies (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999), which suggested that greater *perceived organizational support for one's family* would positively influence the individual's work-family enrichment. Perhaps numerous methodological issues may explain these results or the organization's method of providing assistance for individuals' family issues is misguided. If the issue is the latter, the organization should investigate best practices of family friendly policies and procedures to ensure greater *work-family enrichment*. Another explanation for this result could be the lack of communication of the organization's family policies and goals. Thus, the employees are unaware of the benefits that could be gained through using the policies.

A possible fourth reason for the *perceived organizational support* results is that the individuals believe that the organization only invests in them if it serves to benefit the organization. This implication would suggest that the organization would support the individual's well-being as it can identify the benefits it would gain but it would not support the individual's families, as it cannot identify the benefits the organization would gain.

Group differences

The findings indicated that there is no significant difference between men and women in experiencing *work-family enrichment*. These findings contradict previous literature that men and women emphasize different roles in their lives due to their gender specific socialization (Rothbard, 2001). Men have traditionally supported their families financially while the traditional women's role was to nurture the family and provide the necessary support to ensure the smooth functioning of the family (Wayne et al., 2007).

A possible explanation for the lack of result could be changing perceptions of gender roles. It is common for both men and women to participate in the work and family environment thus stressing a more egalitarian approach to gender roles (ten Brummelhuis, van der Lippe, Kluwer and Flap, 2008). Such an egalitarian norm supports the finding of the study and contradicts the assumption of traditional roles for men and women. Women have become more active in the work role while men have been seen to participate more in the family responsibilities. Hence there would be an equal opportunity for each gender to accumulate and develop resources in one role that would positively impact on the other role. The average sample age was 36 that indicates a younger generation where the change in traditional roles is more acceptable.

Educational and occupational levels were not significant in the individuals' experience of *work-family enrichment*. This was contradictory to the expectation that individuals with greater responsibility at work or job prestige would be exposed to greater opportunities to develop and identify resources (financial rewards and

feelings of accomplishment) that would be beneficial to their family environment (Wayne et al., 2007).

These findings indicate that individuals across job levels and educational backgrounds felt that they had the same opportunity to develop resources that would positively impact their family lives, thereby increasing their ability to experience *work-family enrichment*.

Suggestions for Future Research

The findings emphasize the positive benefits work and family roles can have on each other and suggest a number of areas that require further exploration:

- 1) This study was conducted using a cross-sectional research design, thus causal relationships were not established. Future studies should be conducted using a longitudinal design that would enable enrichment to be examined over a period of time.
- 2) Future research designs could include other sources of information namely, supervisory, co-workers, spouses and other family members to ensure a full picture of the experience of work-family enrichment for the individual.
- 3) The findings also indicated that the various types of social support suggest that if an individual feels cared for and supported in their work and family settings, there is a greater chance that the individual would experience enhanced work-family enrichment. However, the study does not examine the different paths (instrumental and emotional) through which

al., 2004). Personality characteristics merely enhance *work-family enrichment* but it is the resources that the organization provides that an individual with these characteristics can identify the positives and transfer and use in their family role. This shows that it is the individual's responsibility to act and think in a positive light yet the organization could assist by providing training that motivates and encourages the individuals to develop more *self-efficacy* and positive self-belief through motivational speakers and self-awareness workshops.

The study also provides evidence that it would be beneficial for management to treat individuals by acknowledging the multiple roles they perform. According to Hanson et al. (2006) the more skills employees stated that they could transfer from work to the family role, the higher their job satisfaction and engagement. In this study individuals were able to develop resources regardless of their occupational or educational level. Therefore when considering different types of training, it would be beneficial for an organization to use a dual-purpose learning approach for all employees. Dual-purpose learning refers to training where work and family applications are taught together (Bird, 2006). For example, time and project management training skills that could be used practically at work and in the individual's family role.

Family support helped predict all three of its dimensions of *F2W enrichment*. This finding is important for organizations as individuals who receive support from their family are more likely to experience greater job satisfaction and are able to generate resources which could enhance their job performance. This indicates that organizations

should ensure that their employees have work-family balance and provide employees with opportunities to spend time with their families. This flexibility could be achieved through flexitime, compressed work weeks and homeworking. Another method to promote work-family balance is to change the individual's perceptions of the "balancing act". The individuals could be shown in presentations or workshops that the various roles in their life are mutually beneficial rather than conflicting.

A potential implication of the finding that *work commitment* helps predict *W2F enrichment* is that HR Practitioners should consider interventions to strengthen the relationship between *work commitment* and *work-family enrichment*. This could be achieved by providing individuals with opportunities that would affirm their *work commitment*; in other words, giving individuals various awards and recognizing work accomplishments or family milestones (Wayne et al., 2004). *Work engagement* also helped predict *W2F enrichment*. Therefore organizations that encourage individuals to become fully engaged in their work roles by building autonomy and complexity into jobs will increase an individual's engagement (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005).

Wayne et al., (2007) stated that people are inclined to develop strong bonds with others and their jobs provide them with meaningful interpersonal exchanges. Supervisors are clearly an integral part of individuals' experiences in the working environment and ultimately have direct impact on the individual's job attitude and the individual's ability to integrate work and family. Supervisors may need to be encouraged and trained to support their employees' needs as this

would lead to greater retention, higher commitment and job satisfaction among employees.

This study also emphasizes the need for supervisors to be trained on work-family balance issues to ensure that the individual's work-family conflict can be limited. Supervisors make the choices to adopt various policies and procedures which would reward and support employees, hence the supervisor would also influence the individual's perception of the organization and the individual's ability to use the organization's family benefits (Allen, 2001). The organization's management must also agree and support the organizations work-family goals and effectively communicate these goals and policies to the employees. The organization must be seen to support work-family goals rather than just developing the policies (Grandey, Cordeiro, Michael, 2007).

Therefore, regardless of the individual's occupational or educational level it is essential for the organization to provide them with support, work engagement and work commitment opportunities, as this would positively impact the organization and the individual.

Final Notes

This study extended the existing work-family literature in several ways. First, this study investigated the positive side of the work-family interface thereby responding to calls to develop the limited knowledge of this topic. Second, this study provides a platform to assess the portability of theoretical models (i.e. Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) to the South African context. Third, the different ways in which work and family roles benefit from one another were examined and the study made an important contribution by identifying significant *work-family*

enrichment antecedents that enhance an individual's experience of enrichment. There has been very limited research on the antecedents of *work-family enrichment*.

The importance of social support emerged as an especially notable antecedent of *work-family enrichment*. *Family support* was shown to predict *work-family enrichment* by giving the individual solid work advice, providing the individual with a soundboard to raise work concerns and assist with daily household chores. The work support indicated that supervisors' support was seen to enhance enrichment through supporting one's family responsibility while *perceived organizational support* was necessary to ensure the individuals' well-being. Such support could then encourage the individual to act reciprocally by being more committed and engaged in their work. Both *work commitment* and *work engagement* were shown to predict *work-family enrichment*. It was also noted that certain personality characteristics (*positive affectivity* and *self-efficacy*) serve to enhance the effects of enrichment.

Contrary to previous research, gender was found to be insignificant in the individual's experience of work-family enrichment. This finding could have important implications for future research and for the necessary development of work practices that benefit both men and women.

Most importantly this study is the first of its kind to examine *work-family enrichment* and its antecedents within the South African context. Most of the research has been conducted in the United States and therefore it was interesting to investigate whether the antecedents

identified and suggested in another country would be relevant to the South African circumstances.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 414-435.
- Ametea, E. S., Cross, E. G., Clark, J. E., & Bobby, C. L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-orientated men and women: the life role salience scales. *Journal of Marriage and the family, 48*, 831-838.
- Aryee, S., & Luk, V. (1996). Work and nonwork influences on the career satisfaction of dual-career couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*, 38-52.
- Baker, E., Israel, B., & Schurman, S. (1996). Role of control and support in occupational stress: An integrated model. *Social Science and Medicine, 43*, 1145-1159.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.
- Barnett, R. C. & Hyde, J. H. (2001). Women, men, work, and family. *American Psychologist, 56*, 781-796.
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work-family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 487-500.

- Bird, J. (2006). Work life balance. Doing it right and avoiding the pitfalls. *Employment Relations Today*, 33, 3.
- Boyar, S. L., & Mosley, D. C. (2007). The relationship between core self-evaluations and work and family satisfaction: The medicating role of work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 265-281.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 131-164.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 62-83.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 127-197.
- Erickson, R. J. (1993). Reconceptualizing family-work: The effect of emotion work on perceptions of marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 888-900.

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist*, 60, 678–686.
- Friedman, S. D. & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family – Allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 145–167.
- Grandey, A. A., Cordeiro, B. L., & Michael H. J., (2007). Work-family supportiveness organizational perceptions: Important for the well-being of male blue-collar hourly workers? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 460–478.
- Graves, L. M., Ohlott, P. J., & Ruderman, M. N. (2007). Commitment to family roles: Effects on managers' attitudes and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1, 44-56.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64-86.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 72-92.

- Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Wayne, J. H. (2006). A multi-level perspective on the synergies between work and family. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 559-574.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 248-261.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2005). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 97-109.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111-126.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate data analysis (5th ed.). Patpargani: Pearson Education Inc.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1134-1145.

- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work–family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*, 249–265.
- Heuven, E., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., & Huisman, N. (2006). The role of self-efficacy in performing emotion work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 222-235.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits–self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability–with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80–92.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724.
- King, L. A., Mattimore, L. K., King, D. A., & Adams, G. A., (1995) Family Support Inventory for Workers: A New Measure of Perceived Social Support from Family Members. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 235-258.
- Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., van Dooren, L. J. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 521-532.

- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921–936.
- Moore, J. (2006). Homeworking and work life balance: does it add to quality of life? *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 56, 5 - 16.
- Pettit, W. P., Kline, J. P. Gencoz, T., & Joiner, T. E. (2001). Are happy people healthier? The specific role of positive affect in predicting self-reported health symptoms. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 521-536.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 825-836.
- Rothbard, N. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655–684.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 33, 464-481.
- Siebert, S. D. (1974). Towards a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Association*, 39, 567-578.

- ten Brummelhuis, L. L., van der Lippe, T., Kluwer, E. S., & Flap, H. (2008). Positive and negative effects of family involvement on work-related burnout. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*, 387-396.
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C., (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 6-15.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392-415.
- Thompson, C. A. & Prottas, D. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 100-118.
- Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for men and women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 279-300.
- Wadsworth, L. L., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The effects of social support on work-family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review, 1*, 75-86.

- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 63-76.
- Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the Big Five to work-family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 108-130.
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 445-461.
- Witt, L. A., & Carlson, D. S., (2006). The work-family interface and job performance: moderating effects of conscientiousness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 343-357.